

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated December 23, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, claims 22-27, 29 and 31 have been amended, and claims 20-21 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 22-39 are pending in the application, with claims 32-39 being withdrawn from consideration. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.


As a preliminary matter, the Office Action states that the IDS filed on January 23, 2004 fails to comply with 37 CFR. 1.98(a) (2), which requires a legible copy of each Non-Patent Literature documents that are listed. Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to 37 CFR 1.98(d)(1-2) which provides the "patent, publication, pending U.S. application or other information" does not need to be submitted because "The earlier application is properly identified in the information disclosure statement and is relied on for an earlier effective filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120; and (2) The information disclosure statement submitted in the earlier application complies with paragraphs (a) through (c) of this section." Applicants submit the non-patent references in which the Office Action refers were submitted in Application Serial No. 10/318,235, filed December 13, 2002, and properly identified in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on January 23, 2004. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the IDS filed on January 23, 2004 be considered in its entirety.

In the Office Action, claims 22 and 24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have rewritten claim 22 to independent form and amended claim 24 to depend from claim 22. Accordingly, the objection is overcome.

In the Office Action, claims 20-21, 23 and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0180901, issued to Kim. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Kim fails to teach each and every feature recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Kim fails to teach or suggest an array substrate for an in-plane switching mode liquid crystal display device wherein “the dummy line communicates with the auxiliary line” as recited in amended, independent claim 22. Because Kim fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of independent claim 22, claim 22 and its dependent claims 23-31 are allowable over Kim. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Application No.: 10/762,327  
Amendment. dated March 10, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated December 23, 2004



Docket No.:8733.742.20

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: March 10, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes  
Valerie P. Hayes  
Registration No.: 53,005  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant

DC:50312243.1